



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,821	01/09/2001	Kevin A. McCullough	P00405-US1	6144
3017	7590	10/21/2003	EXAMINER	
BARLOW, JOSEPHS & HOLMES, LTD. 101 DYER STREET 5TH FLOOR PROVIDENCE, RI 02903			ROSENBAUM, IRENE CUDA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3726		

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

C8

Offic Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	09/756,821	MCCULLOUGH
	Examiner Irene Cuda-Rosenbaum	Art Unit 3726

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

P riod for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disp sition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-2 and 7-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-2 17-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Intervi w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mashiko et al for the reasons set forth in paper no.12 and 16.

Applicant argues that Mashikoo et al teach a heat sink assembly with a base plate with integrally molded fins and that applicant is claiming "separate heat dissipating pin members" Applicant further argues that "Thus, in Applicants method, a single mold containing integrated sections for the base plate and pins is not used and the resulting heat pipe construction is not a unitary , molded structure". However, applicant's claim merely calls for "to form a base plate and providing separate heat-dissipating pin members on the surface of the base plate." The pins of Mashikoo et al are separate from the base plate(separate only requires that they be a different part, which they are) as claimed by applicant. Applicant's claims are not reflected in the arguments. No other feature or dependent claim has been argued by applicant and therefore it is considered that all other issues in the claims are not contested by the applicant.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Cuda-Rosenbaum whose telephone number is 703-308-1792. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexi time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 703-308-1148. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7058 for regular communications and 703-308-7058 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

ICR
October 20, 2003

Irene Cuda-Rosenbaum
Art 3726